REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-20, 23-30, 34-43 were pending. Claims 7, 31, and 43 have been amended, leaving claims 1, 4-20, 23-31, and 34-43 pending.

Claims 34-41 stand objected to as being dependent on a canceled claim. Claims 1, 4-20, 23-26, and 34-43 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,614,861 issued to Pavlov (hereafter "Pavlov") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,766 issued to Spratte (hereafter "Spratte") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,731,575 issued to Zingher et al. (hereafter "Zingher"). Applicants aver that no new matter has been added in this response.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 34-41 as being dependent on canceled claim 31. In the previous amendment, claim 31 was labeled as "cancelled" in error. The claim was not cancelled and that label is corrected here. This should overcome the objection to claims 34-41.

§103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-20, 23-26, and 34-43 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pavlov in view of Spratte, in further view of Zingher.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is allowable over Pavlov, Spratte, and Zingher alone or in combination, as those references fail to disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites in part "for at least one input access code <u>not equaling said user's access code</u>, said output datum <u>has the characteristic appearance of said at least a portion of said confidential datum, but said output datum does not reproduce at least a portion of said user's confidential datum</u>". (emphasis added)

Appl. No. 09/874,795
Amdt. dated November 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

PATENT

Pavolov discloses receiving a PIN from a user and comparing that PIN to a stored PIN and upon favorable comparison, generating a PIN validation signal that triggers the generation of a key, among other steps. It should be noted that a valid key is generated when the correct PIN is entered. Pavlov does not appear to disclose or suggest that an invalid key be generated when an incorrect PIN is entered. Thus, even if Pavlov's key output could be considered as teaching the claimed output datum and Pavlov's PIN could be considered as teaching the claimed user's access code, Pavlov does not teach all of the elements of the claim. For example, Pavlov does not disclose or suggest generating an output datum wherein for at least one input access code not equaling said user's access code, said output datum has the characteristic appearance of said at least a portion of said confidential datum, but said output datum does not reproduce at least a portion of said user's confidential datum

Spratte does not make up for the claim elements not taught or suggested in Pavlov. For example, while Spratte discloses combining additional text, referred to as salt "S", to a primary secret key (K_p) and the results are hashed to create an encryption key K_e, Spratte is not directed to considering user access codes. Furthermore, Spratte does not disclose or suggest generating an output datum that has the characteristic appearance of the valid datum.

Zingher discloses an ATM that looks out for a personal distress number (PDN) in addition to a user's PIN. In Zingher's system, when the user enters a PIN, the system compares it to the user's stored PIN. If it matches, the transaction proceeds normally and access is granted. If it doesn't match, the user's entry is compared with the user's stored PDN. If it matches, a distress signal is sent and the ATM behavior is altered to take into account that the user entered the PDN rather than the PIN. Some of the behavior is altered in a way that someone forcing the user to use the ATM would not immediately notice that the number entered was a PDN rather than a PIN.

In any of the three cases described above, the claimed output datum is not generated and even if something that the system generated could be interepreted as being an output datum, there does not appear to be anything in Zingher that would suggest that such a

Appl. No. 09/874,795
Amdt. dated November 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

PATENT

thing might take on a characteristic appearance when other than the correct user access code is entered.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. As claim 1 is allowable, claims 4-19 dependent therefrom are also allowable for at least that reason.

Claim 20

Claim 20 recites similar features as those recited in claim 1, and thus claim 20 should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. As claim 20 is allowable, claims 23-30 dependent therefrom are also allowable for at least that reason.

Claim 31

Claim 31 recites similar features as those recited in claim 1, and thus claim 31 should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. As claim 31 is allowable, claims 34-41 dependent therefrom are also allowable for at least that reason.

Claim 42

Claim 42 recites similar features as those recited in claim 1, and thus claim 42 should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1.

Claim 43

Claim 43 as amended is allowable over Pavlov, Spratte, and Zingher alone or in combination, as those references fail to disclose or suggest all the elements of amended claim 43.

For example, claim 43 recites a method comprising "generation-camouflaging at least a portion of said access-controlled datum such as to be reproducible by an authorized user thereof but non-reproducible by an unauthorized user thereof, wherein when an incorrect datum is entered reproducing a generation-camouflaged datum such that the reproduced datum has a characteristic appearance of the user's access-controlled datum." (emphasis added) As described above, Pavlov and Spratte do not disclose or suggest an output when an incorrect user access code is entered, and Zingher does not disclose or suggest reproducing a generation-camouflaged

Appl. No. 09/874,795
Amdt. dated November 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

PATENT

datum such that the reproduced datum <u>has a characteristic appearance of the user's access-controlled datum when an incorrect datum is entered</u>. Therefore, Pavlov, Spratte, and Zingher alone or in combination do not teach all of the elements of claim 43.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that claim 43 is allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Bart Sullivan
Reg. No. 41,516

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
CBS:rgy

60625798 v1